1:Stanford U. S-4. 5 1956 AF12 North China AF12

On the other hand, because of the existence of extended families and the clan structure, less fortunate members of these groups might be helped by relatives to gain a living or an education. A substantial amount of land was usually allotted to the communal family or clan for religious, educational, or charitable purposes by illustrious members of the family or clan. Nepotism was simply a projection of the family ideal of mutual help among the members. Clan nepotism often accounted for a man's rise on the social and economic ladder. This practice contributed to the upward movement of poorer segments of the population who otherwise might never have advanced socially and economically in a relatively short period of time.

The Scholar Ideal. Learing was much esteemed, especially when combined with wealth. The prestige of the wealthy was never complete until their wealth was adorned with culture. Indication of respect for learning was common in China, as typified by the saying: "Although your children may be of low intelligence, you as parents should make them study the Classics."[5]

---

5. This stress on learning and cultivation of the Chinese was studied by Max Weber. In his Religion of China Weber goes so far as to conclude that this emphasis caused the lack of capital accumulation necessary for the development of modern capitalism in China. While this analysis may be over simple, it indicates how the traditional supremacy of officialdom over the merchant

575 the support of politicians, warlords as well as capitalists. Even the Kuomintang leaders had to come to terms with the society in their campaign against the warlords, and the Japanese occupation forces during 1937-1945 utilized Ch'ing-pang organizations to rout Communist underground agents.[8]

II. DISRUPTION OF THE TRADITIONAL SOCIAL STRUCTURE

647 546 178 Just as the scholar ideal and the family ideal helped to preserve the stability of the total social order of China, the disintegration of the traditional family system and the abolition of the imperial examination system for recruiting the ruling elite became contributing factors to the dislocation of the traditional social structure.

621 423 565 369 There was no change in the social composition of the rural population in the past several decades. As of old, the village community consisted of farm laborers at the bottom and landlords at the top. Peasant landowners and tenants constituted the bulk of the village population; and village peddlers, merchants, and artisans were members of peasant families, most of which owned land; the village gentry, that is to say the local leaders were mostly retired officials or educated members of landlords' or rich peasants' families.[9]

---

8. Ibid., pp. 64-65.

9. Olga Lang, Chinese Family and Society, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1946, p. 68.

618 621 the tsu for the yearly rites honoring its ancestors, this social institution served to bring the poor and uncultured into contact with, and under the influence of, the well-to-do and educated gentry. Its more accomplished members headed the clan and represented the closest approximation to the ideal of the "superior man" (chün tzu). Meetings with such men, whose behavior was patterned by leisure and education beyond the means of the great majority of society, provided the lower classes with living models for emulation and opportunities to impress the young with the proper attitude of respect toward their social superiors.

631 Another institution based on the family utilized by the state was the pao-chia system. As it was constituted under the Ch'ing Dynasty (1644 to 1912) and again in the 1930's by the Nationalist Government, ten adjacent families were grouped as a p'ai, ten p'ai as a chia, and ten chia, or one thousand households, as a pao. The head of each unit was responsible for the conduct and defense of those households under him, and the head of the pao had to answer to the government for the conduct and protection of the thousand households.

D. Economic Role

423 596 As the definition of the term "family" infers, it was the basic economic unit of the society. Real property such as land, houses,

and workshops were owned by the family rather than by individuals. When disharmony caused the breakup of a joint family, its real property was divided among the constituent conjugal families, each as a new family claiming title to the portion of property which fell to its share.

The peasant, artisan, and small-merchant families were units of both production and consumption. Male family members worked together in the fields, workshops, or stores to produce the goods on which the family mainly relied for a living. Sons nearly always followed their father's occupation and seldom left home. Women worked in the home, taking care of the children and turning out the family's clothes and shoes. Where sericulture was practiced, women managed the entire industry from the cultivation of mulberry trees to the weaving of cloth. Food and clothing were allotted each member according to his needs, as they were determined by the head of the house and permitted by the family's circumstances.

Some variation from this pattern occurred among the upper-class families. Gentry-officials and merchants were often away from home; they frequently had personal income from salaries or business, from which they met their expenses without resorting to the family treasury.

The family and its extensions in China

1:Stanford U. S-4, 5 1956 AF 12 North China
~~AF 12~~ AF12

III. PARTY CONTROL IN THE RURAL AREAS

665

Political power in the rural areas is the key to Communist power in North China. Here lies the strength and the weakness of the region, and of the Party; here the pattern of political dynamics is the most revealing, and the Communist power encounters the greatest opposition.

With the exception of the first few years prior to 1951, when a different set of policies was pursued by the Communists in the North China Region, the general pattern of the development of the Communist political power remained the same as in other regions. In the main, three periods can be: (1) the initial construction period--prior to the completion of land reform in the spring of 1950, when political power was centered in the Peasants Association; (2) the consolidation period -- a period of expansion in areas after land reform and consolidation of agricultural producers' co-operatives in other areas; (3) the election and post-constitutional period. The continuous suppression of opposition during the election of 1953-54, however, gave a firm base to Communist political power. The post-constitution period displayed a renewed consolidation of political power upon the basis of gradual collectivization of agriculture.

A. The Initial Construction (1948 Fall to September 1951)

423
665

Prior to the convening of the First Conference

4/23 of County Head in North China[53] in September 665 1951, land reform was the key task in the "newly liberated" areas, whereas in the "old liberated" areas, elections and consolidation of ts'un (village) People's representative conferences topped other business. Experiences gained from the election no doubt served ad models for the areas in the North China Region, as well as in the nation as a whole.

1. Land Reform and Political Construction. In the North China Region,[54] land reform was taking place in the "newly liberated" areas in four provinces: Hopei, Shansi, Chahar, and Pingyuan, but no in Suiyuan, between December 1949 and early 1950. As of April 1950, 25,500 villages (78 per cent of the total villages) in the "newly liberated" area announced the completion of land reform. Although land reform was carried out in a relatively mild way in the North China Region, it accomplished the political aims of abolishing the land-ownership system and of destroying existing political forces in the rural districts.

Owing to the rich experience available in this region and to the small area affected, land reform was rapidly concluded. Nevertheless, all available forces were mobilzed for the tedious task. In Hopei Province alone, land reform cadres of more than 20,000 were organized into teams.

---

53. Report on Conference in People's Daily, Oct. 3, 1951, p. 1. For resolutions adopted consult Yangtze Daily, Nov. 21, 1951, p. 4.

54. People's Daily, April 24, 1950, p. 2.

•423 They included land reform "experts" from the
665 old liberated" areas, students, and workers from mass organizations. The land reform team of 469 serving in the suburbs of Peking,[55] for example included 135 such "experts." Another feature of the land reform in the North China region was the lenient policy adopted. For example, the establishment of people's tribunals was discouraged and their use was carefully handled so as not to avoid terror among the populace. This lenient policy was deemed necessary because of the proximity of this region to the national capital and of the large number of minority groups in this region.

During the land reform, power centers in the rural areas remained: (1) the Party, (2) the Peasant Associations, (3) the hsiang government, and (4) the militia. Of these four, the Peasant Association and the militia were of special importance.

423 The Peasant Association was the executive
668 agent of the land reform. It possessed the power
665 to decide all important questions relating to land reform. It was an organization primarily of poor peasants, who constituted two-thirds of the membership; the other one-third was filled by middle peasants. Prior to the active execution of the land reform, Communists attempted to include all poor and middle peasants in the Peasant Association and the membership was large. In Shansi province, it stood at 200,000; in the county

55. People's Daily, Nov. 23, 1950, p. 2.

668 423 665 of Yü-tsi 80 per cent of the peasants were members of the Peasant Association.[56]

665 423 701 The militia served as another instrument of terror at the disposal of the Party. It is an organization of poor peasants and farm laborers (67 per cent) and of youth (aged 18-30) and is strongly class-conscious.

At the end of the land reform in North China,[57] the militia's strength was placed at 2,371,900. In Shansi Province alone, it was 373,250 in November 1950. Needless to say, the militia in this region had participated in guerrilla warfare against the Japanese and later assisted the Communists to defeat the Nationalists. They were well-organized and had gone through several consolidations and readjustments. In addition to the normal duties assigned to the militia, such as guarding granaries, bridges and transportation centers and escorting food transportation, the militia was also expected to assist in coastal defense. In most cases, they were organized into teams, such as highway patrol groups, coastal defense squads, and village joint-defense teams. In the Paoting administrative district, 665 such village teams were organized among the 4,715 villages.[58]

665 623 2. Election of Ts'un (village) Peoples' Representative Conference and Political Consolidation in the "old liberated" areas. The election of

56. Ibid., April 24, 1950, p. 2.
57 Ibid., Oct. 25, 1950, p. 1.
58 Hopei Daily, August 1, p. 3.

1:Stanford U. S-4, 5 1956 AF 12 North China
AF 12

669 223 After January 1949, Nationalist forces held out in the Taiyuan area of Shansi until May 1949, but most of the Nationalist units in the western part of Suiyuan accepted the Communist "reorganization" plan. The quick end of organized resistance in the North China Region not only released a large portion of the Communist forces for the offensive in Central-South China, but also made unnecessary an extermination campaign against Nationalist "bandits" in the North China Region.

A report issued by the North China Military Command at the beginning of 1950 triumphantly announced the extermination of all Nationalist troops and other "armed bandits."[5] Tasks assigned to the troops under the command of the North China Military Command were then centered on training and reorganization, assistance in agricultural production, and the strengthening of the local militia.

B. Landlords

• 423 After the Land Reform Movement in the North China Region, landlordism as a system of land ownership was largely eradicated. Some landlords died during the land reform period; others, including those sentenced to imprisonment for a year or less, were placed under the surveillance of public security agencies. The released landlords were given a piece of land

5. Ibid., January 9, 1950, p. 2.

• 423 to work or were required to serve in forced labor camps. Others, classified as counter-revolutionaries within the meaning of the term as used in Decree on the Suppression of Counterrevolutionaries by the Ministry of Public Security of the Government Administration Council in February 1951, were deprived of all political rights and placed under surveillance for a period of not less than three years.[6] These ex-landlords were placed in forced labor camps under the supervision of public security agencies and were subject to being sent to any area where a large labor force was required. There is no doubt that former landowners constituted the major portion of the forced labor battalions in Communist China.

565 423 687 After land reform, many peasants and Party members had become members of the so-called "new rich," and as such were regarded by the Communists as "potential landlords." The growth of a new moneyed class was particularly serious in the North China Region. (See Party control in the rural areas in the chapter on Political Dynamics in this handbook.) The activities of these "potential landlords" were exhaustively reported. They were accused of contemplating or actually attempting hostile acts against the regime with the collaboration of former landlords; more particularly, they were accused of attempting to seize control of the rural government and of attempting to destroy

6. Test of the regulation in ibid, Feb. 22, 1951, p. 1.

565 the system of agricultural producers' co-operatives. In December 1954, renewed warnings
• 423 against them were voiced by the Communists.
687 The case of Ch'ang-li hsien was cited. According to the report, former landlords, aided by the "new rich," had succeeded in infiltrating a producers' co-operative in order to destroy it. Having become members of the co-operative, the "counterrevolutionaries" bribed Party cadres and employed collaborators to capture key positions in the organization. They spread rumors and created dissension in an effort to disorganize the co-operative. The Communists accused members of the co-operative of showing contempt for the poor peasants by inviting "rich peasants" to join. (Regulations forbid the acceptance of landlords and "rich peasants" as members of the co-operatives.) Landlords were charged with creating unrest in the rural areas, burning granaries, killing cattle, murdering Communist members, and destroying dams and agricultural implements owned by the co-operatives.

C. Suppression of Nationalist Elements and Espionage Activities

668 The suppression of counterrevolutionaries in North China at first was carried out under joint direction of the Government Administration Council and the People's Supreme Court.[8]

---

7. Ibid., Dec. 15, 1954, p. 1.

8. Report on the suppression of counterrevolutionaries in Hopei Province, Ho-pei Jih-pao [Hopei Daily], Oct. 30, 1950, p. 1.

1:Stanford U. S-4, 5 1956 AF12 North China
~~AF12~~ AF12

161 It is evident from the foregoing table that the average land holding per farm household in the suburban area of Tientsin municipality was only 13.3 shih-mou (2.2 acres) in 1955, the lowest amount in the region. Shansi Province, with 29.3 shih-mou (4.9 acres), was the highest. Compared with the national average per household (15 shih-mou, or 2.5 acres), Hopei is somewhat lower and Shansi is almost 100 per cent higher.[5]

II. THE LAND REFORM MOVEMENT

• 423 The Land Reform Movement in North China was carried out in two stages: (1) in the old "liberated" areas the program had been completed before the end of 1949 and (2) in the so-called "new areas," land reform began in December 1949 and was all but complete in April 1950. The methods used in land reform in this region, as in Northeast China, differed somewhat from the methods used in other regions. In areas where the redistribution of land had been completed, the

5. Mao Tze-tung's report on the collectivization movement, Hua-ch'iao Jih-pao [China Daily News], New York, Oct. 28, 1955.

1:Stanford U. S-4, 5 1956 AF12 North China
~~AF12~~ AF 12

423 peasants were allowed to maintain their status in order to continue production. In "new areas" which had suffered from flood and drought land reform was temporarily postponed. In principle, the property belonging to landlords was confiscated and apportioned among "poor peasants" and "laborers". Landlords who owned small businesses were granted a certain measure of protection so that normal industrial production and trading activities need not be interrupted.

The Communists adapted land reform to the two suburban districts of the municipalities of Peking and Tientsin. In Peking, about 1,105,800 shih-mou (184,600 acres) of cultivated land were divided into seven districts consisting of 180 hsiang (villages), with a total population [6] of 640,000. The land reform program in these districts began in October 1949 and was completed in March 1950. In this area the following measures were introduced: All the land "confiscated" from the landlords was reserved as sites for public buildings and industrial plants. In order to make full use of these lands for productive

6. Compendium of Government Reports, 1950, Peking, 1951, pp. 249-57.

423 purposes, the government allowed plots of land to be cultivated by "poor peasants" and "farm laborers". Only a portion of the rented lands of the "rich peasants" was requisitioned; they were allowed to keep as much land as they could work as well as their draft animals, farm tools, and other property. The land, draft animals, farm tools, and other property of the landlords were confiscated; in an effort to persuade them to continue agricultural production, they were given a portion of land and other properties equivalent to that given an ordinary "poor peasant" or "farm laborer".[7]

The whole process of "land reform" in the suburbs of Peking took place in less than six months, and the results were reported to be "satisfactory," meaning, perhaps, without unnecessary violence or civil disturbance. According to the 1950 report on the municipality of Peking, 402,900 shih-mou (67,150 acres) of land, 1,743 draft animals, 69,083 farm tools, 13,320 shih-piculs (732.6 tons) of grain, and 27,278 dwellings and/or "rooms" were confiscated or requisitioned during the "land

7. Ibid.

1:Stanford U, S-4, 5 1956 AF12 North China
~~AF12~~ AF 12

423 reform." [8] The confiscated land was redistributed among 229,892 persons. "Local despots" were arrested and tried in the local People's court. Only a few were sentenced to death; the remainder were imprisoned or set free to engage in productive labor.[9]

The principles of "land reform" as instrumented in the municipality of Peking were adopted for the suburban districts of Tientsin, an area where the total amount of land under cultivation is 160,000 shih-mou (26,667 acres). Of this amount, 107,157 shih-mou (17,859 acres) were confiscated, and some 50,170 shih-mou (8,361 acres) of land were divided among 40,271 persons.[10]

It has been estimated that, during the "land reform" period in North China, some 126.2 million shih-mou (21 million acres) of land, over 252 million farm animals, 2,524 million shih-piculs(about 140,000 tons) of grain, 12.6 million farm implements, and 1.262 million dwellings, including huts and barns, were confiscated or requisitioned.[11]

---

8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., pp. 294-95.
11. Tsu-kuo Chou-k'an [China Weekly], Hong Kong, March 9, 1953, p. 12.

Their wearers did not belong to the very old group, but were men between 46 and 55 years of age.

A surprisingly small number of persons with physical disabilities were reported in the 515 families.[1] The total was 25. Only three of these were females. There were three blind men and three men and one woman were blind in one eye. Two men were dumb and six were deaf. Lameness was serious enough to be reported for four men and two women. Two men had paralyzed arms and two paralyzed fingers.

With less than one per cent of the group reported as having physical disabilities one cannot but wonder whether the report was incomplete or whether the extra difficulties of life had eliminated others who might have been stricken.

Home Ownership

Home ownership was almost universal for these Ting Hsien families. The figures are 98.8 per cent for the 5,255 families and 96.8 per cent for the 515 families. In a group of families living in Peking only 21.2 per cent owned their homes.[14]

About two-thirds of the non-owners were given the use of their homes, so house rent was paid by only 0.4 per cent of the 5,255 families and by 1.4 per cent of the 515 families. The small proportion of home renters makes it evident that a large proportion of those classed as tenant farmers owned their homes, even though they rented all of the land they farmed. In the 1st District 11.4 per cent of the families were tenant farmers, in the hsien only 4.7 per cent.

The high percentage of home ownership indicates very definitely that Ting Hsien had a steady, settled population and that almost all of the families had been in the area long enough to accumulate the funds needed to buy their homes. Quite a number of the families said that their ancestors came to Ting Hsien about 500 years ago.

In the 71 villages in the 1st District the average family residence area was 2.1 mu, about 100 x 150 feet. In that area the family would have its living quarters, housing for any animals, and storage for all farm equipment and for its food, fodder, and fertilizer.

The total residence area in the 71 villages varied from eight to 800 mu. Sixteen villages had less than 50 mu each. Fourteen had 300 or more mu. The average per family varied from 0.4 mu to 8.2 mu, but

14. Gamble, *op. cit.*

1 [In Ting Hsien -- Analyst].

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF12 North China AF12

128 know that it included more than the average number of the larger and wealthier farms. Because of this difference the families have been divided into groups according to the size of their farms, in order to give a picture of farm activity on different economic levels rather than just for our particular group of families. The farms with not more than 50 mu of land have been divided into five groups, each with a range of 10 mu, and the larger farms into two groups, one with more than 50 but not over 100 mu, the other with over 100 mu. To avoid the constant use of decimals and for ease of designation the group with not more than 10 mu is called the 1–10 mu group, the group with more than 10 mu but not over 20 mu the 11–20 mu group. The families also have been divided into three ownership groups, owners, part-owners, and tenants.

Land Ownership and Area

423 427 Land ownership is always a basic question in any study of farm families. Sixty-one per cent of the 400 families were listed as owners, owning all the land they operated; 33.8 per cent were part-owners, renting part of the land they farmed; 5.2 per cent were tenants who rented all of their land. (See Table 15). The 202 Chai Ch'eng families included in the study were divided 58 per cent owners, 38.5 per cent part-owners, and 3.5 per cent tenants. Our 1931 figures for the entire hsien divided the farming families 70 per cent owners, 25.2 per cent part-owners, and 4.8 per cent tenants. In the six districts of the hsien the proportion of owners ranged from 50.6 to 78 per cent, so it is difficult to find a typical sample.

The total area farmed by the 400 families was 12,377 mu, approximately 3.2 square miles. This was 5.5 per cent of the total farm area of the 62 villages. As a higher proportion of land than families was included in our study, the average size of the 400 farms, 30.9 mu, just over five acres per family, was some 39 per cent larger than the average of all the farms in the Experimental District, 22.2 mu, 3.7 acres per family. It was 46 per cent larger than the hsien average of 21.2 mu, 3.5 acres per farming family. In Chai Ch'eng the average was 26 mu per family.

The averages for our different ownership groups were owners 36.5 mu, part-owners 25.3 mu, and tenants 14.3 mu.

Two and four-tenths per cent of the land was operated by the tenant group and 27.6 per cent by the part-owners. Seventy per cent was farmed by the owner group. The part-owners rented 34 per cent of their farm

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF12 North China AF12

area. Only 11.8 per cent of the total crop area was operated by renters. With 88.2 per cent of owner operation there would be very few of the problems resulting from landlordism and tenancy.

The number of crop mu reported was 15,044. The amount of double cropping therefore was 2,667 mu and the index of double cropping 121. Buck[1] in his land study gave the double cropping index for Hopei province as ranging from 125 to 155. For our three ownership groups there was but little difference in the index. The range was 117 to 124. The lowest was for the tenants, the highest for the part-owners.

We do not have an estimate of the amount of uncultivated and waste land held by the 400 families, nor do we have any figures giving the area of their houses. The latter, of course, were all in the villages and separate from the farm lands. In the 62 villages the cultivated land was 83.3 per cent of the total area; houses 4.7 per cent; roads, graves, and other uncultivated land 12.0 per cent.

A comparison of the averages of the different farm groups shows that many of the differences are directly related to the differences in the size of the farms; the amounts per mu are apt to be quite similar. That being the case, the figures for our 21–30 mu group, with an average farm of 25.6 mu, are probably much more typical for the 62 villages of the Experimental District and for all of Ting Hsien than the averages for the entire 400 families, whose average farm had 30.9 mu. Because of this difference in the averages we have given in the text many more figures for the different sized farm groups than would be the case if we were presenting the 400 farms as a typical and average group.

How the farms were distributed according to size and ownership is shown in Table 16. It will be noted that there were no part-owner or tenant families in the over 100 mu group and no tenant families in the 41–50 mu group. Only three tenant families had more than 20 mu. They operated different sized farms, so the three upper tenant groups had only one family each. Their figures, of course, cannot be taken as typical for those groups. For both the owners and part-owners, the largest group was the 11–20 mu group, 25 and 41.1 per cent respectively. Fifty-two per cent of the tenants were in the 1–10 mu group. Forty-five per cent of all the farms had from one to 20 mu. Their total area was only 18 per cent of the land. The 25 per cent of the families who had over 40 mu had 55 per cent of the land.

1. J. Lossing Buck, *Land Utilization in China* (University of Chicago Press, 1937).

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF12 North China AF12

Size of Family

The 400 families included a total of 2,536 persons, an average of 6.3 persons per family. The total, however, included 64 year-round workers who lived with the families. If they are omitted, the size of the average family was 6.2. How the average size of the family increased as the size of the farm increased, from 3.8 persons for the families with 10 mu or less to 6.7 persons for those in the 31–40 mu group and 13.5 persons for those with over 100 mu, is shown in Table 17. If the 64 full-time workers are omitted, the average family was 8.2 for the 41–50 mu group, 8.8 for the 51–100 mu group, and 11.8 for the over 100 mu group. These were the only groups with enough full-time workers to affect the size of the average family. Ordinarily, we have not omitted the full-time workers as they were given their board by their employers and so were part of the family "mouths".

In other studies of Chinese families, we have regularly found that as the amount of the family income increased the average size of the family increased. In this study increased size of farm holding usually indicates increased family income. From the figures, it appears that there was a tendency for the average size of the family to increase some 35 per cent with a 100 per cent increase in the size of the farm.

The amount of land farmed by the family also appears to have a definite influence on both the number and the proportion of children in the family. The average number of children from one to 10 years of age, Chinese count, increased from 0.6 per family for the 1–10 mu group to 3.2 for the over 100 mu group. The proportion of children was 15 per cent in the families with 30 mu or less, but it was 24 per cent for the families with more than 100 mu.

The population density was 785 persons per square mile of crop area. It was about 650 per square mile if an average area for the home sites in the villages is added to the cultivated area and an allowance made for graves, roads, and wasteland.

For the 400 families the average amount of land per person was 4.8 mu, 0.8 of an acre. For the 1–10 mu group, the average was less than one-third of an acre per person. Table 17 shows how the amount increased as the size of the farm increased until the average for the over 100 mu group was five times the average for the 1–10 mu group.

The 2,536 members listed by the 400 families were divided 1,348

[In Ting Hsien -- Analyst]

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

424 651

hsien kept 10 per cent and sent the rest to the provincial capital. The amount paid from May to December, 1914, was $52,000.

In 1927 the Peking government again issued regulations requiring that all deeds be presented for inspection and that old and new deeds be stamped according to the value of the land. The graduated fee was 10 cents for values under $50, 20 cents under $100, 50 cents under $300, $1.00 under $500, and $2.00 for all values of $500 or more. Not much was done in the matter until February, 1928. Then each village was required to register a minimum number of deeds depending on its size; at least 500 deeds by villages with from 50 to 200 families, at least 1,500 deeds by those with from 200 to 500 families, and at least 3,000 deeds by those with from 500 to 1,000 families. The collection of the inspection fee was finally passed on to the village heads and they were required to finish the work in half a month. The government was anxious to complete the program before the arrival of the Nationalist forces.

The Nationalist government also instituted a deed registration program in 1927, in order to get money for the provincial governments, but Ting Hsien was not affected until 1929, when the program was applied to Hopei province. Then the representatives of 96 hsien went to Peking to protest against a second registration program in two years, but the best they could do was to get the time of collection extended.

423 651

The regular annual land tax, which produced some 22 per cent of the tax income from the hsien, was based, according to the hsien history, on a classification of the privately owned land set up by the Emperor Wan Li (1572–1619). In order to have a uniform tax rate, but still relate the amount of the tax to the value of the land, the size of each plot of land was fixed in terms of an elastic size tax mu, larger than the standard mu. The number of standard mu in a tax mu was determined by the quality of the land. Three and one-half mu of good land, five mu of medium grade land, seven mu of poor land, and 14 mu of very poor land were equivalent to one tax mu. The land so rated was known as the o nei land (fixed number of mu). The number of large mu on the 1929 tax roll was 224,223.4. This was the same as the figure given for 1657 except for 21,361.1 mu that had been destroyed by four floods in the 19th century and therefore removed from the tax rolls.

The records show that early in the Ch'ing dynasty the taxed land was divided into three classes: (1) land owned by gentry who were exempt from the surtax imposed to replace a head tax and a national labor

2: Gamble 8-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

corvée (later this land lost its exemption and was added to class 2); (2) land of other resident owners; (3) land of absentee owners. At that time 11 per cent of the tax mu were in class 3. The first and second classes paid the same basic tax rate, 13.195 tael cents per tax mu, but for the third class the rate was 14.159 cents, 8.51 per cent higher, because of the owners' inability to perform any local labor service.

During the first part of the Sung dynasty a large military force was maintained in Ting Hsien and a considerable portion of the hsien, possibly as much as one-quarter of the arable land, was held as government land to be cultivated by the troops. The crops provided the food needed by the army. In 1659, farmers in Fang Shan Hsien and Liang Hsiang Hsien were given most of the cultivated military land in Ting Hsien to compensate them for their lands that had been taken and given to Manchu princes and officers as a reward for their services in the establishment of the new Manchu dynasty. Land used for drill grounds and barracks, or to provide food for disaster relief or income for soldiers' salaries and schools, and all uncultivated land apparently was kept by Ting Hsien.

The Ting Hsien land distributed to the Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang farmers became a tax enclave in Ting Hsien with the tax income belonging to those hsien rather than to Ting Hsien. The land had not been taxed when it was held as government property; hence it had made no contribution to the Ting Hsien budget. It was assessed when distributed to private owners, but, as it replaced land formerly assessed by Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang, but tax free in the hands of the new Manchu owners, the Ting Hsien authorities were required to collect the taxes and remit them to Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang hsien. Although all the regular land taxes belonged to the provincial government, the advantage that accrued to the remitting hsien was preserved, at least in part, for Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang hsien by transmitting the new Ting Hsien taxes through them.

A large part of the land allocated to the Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang farmers was gradually reclaimed by Ting Hsien when (1) the land was sold to Ting Hsien residents; (2) there were no heirs in a family that had been given land; (3) any of the land was confiscated; (4) land that was barren when distributed later became fertile; (5) any of the confiscated land in Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang hsien was returned to the original owner. The recovery was not complete, for the 1929 tax records

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

4/23 651

indicated that Ting Hsien was still collecting taxes for Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang hsien. The amount of the enclaved land was not given.

The recovered land in groups 2 to 5 was sold to private owners and the land in all five classes was added to the Ting Hsien tax rolls. The recovered area, together with the government land, drill grounds, uncultivated land, etc., that had been kept by Ting Hsien in 1659 but later sold for private use, was known as the o wei land. It was outside the tax area as fixed by Wan Li.

The recovery of land from Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang and the sale of the government land evidently took place before 1753, for the tax records of that year and those for 1929 show the same number of o wei mu, except for 11,304 mu destroyed by floods in the 19th century and 2,680 mu transferred to Hsin Le Hsien soon after the establishment of the Republic. The 1929 total was 341,636.3 mu. The land recovered from Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang hsien was 257,546.3 mu, 72 per cent of the o wei total.

Because of the different kinds and sources of the o wei land it was assessed in eight different categories, with six different tax rates. The records do not indicate that any attempt was made to adjust the tax rates to the different values of the land within the different categories. The basic o wei rate varied from 1.0 tael cents per mu for the barracks land, the drill grounds, and the land that had been used to grow food for disaster relief, to 2.229 cents per mu for the land recovered from Fang Shan and Liang Hsiang, 3.0 cents per mu for the land for soldiers' salaries, and 13.2 cents per mu for school land. The average rate was 1.9518 cents per mu. Both the land area and the amount of tax were figured to three decimal places.

A third classification was added to the land list in 1914, when the hsien officials were asked to collect the rent on land that had been owned, tax free, by Manchu families and where (1) the family had died out; (2) Manchu landlords had paid their agents for their services by giving them land subject to a small rent charge and the agents were trying to avoid paying the rent; (3) land had been confiscated because of crime. The average rent charge was 10.43 tael cents per mu on (1), 4.45 cents per mu on (2), and 14.6 cents per mu on (3). The rent collected on (1) was paid to individuals as directed by the provincial government, on (2) to the landlords, and on (3) was apparently kept by the hsien. For its services in connection with the first two groups the hsien was paid a

2. Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 . AF 12 North China AF 12

commission of 13 cents per tael, the equivalent of the maximum charge sometimes levied on tax payments to compensate for the taxpayer using poor quality silver when paying his tax bill. The area of the Manchu land involved was 5,584 mu.

In 1927 this Manchu land was classified and offered for sale to private owners. It was entered on the tax roll with an average tax rate of 2.937 tael cents per mu.

A head tax was part of the Ming tax program. The families were divided into three different categories and there were three classes in each category. The lowest rate was 10 tael cents per head. The classification of the family and the size of the family were reviewed and adjusted every five years. In 1713 K'ang Hsi decreed that there should be no further revision of the size of the family and that all families should pay 10 cents per head. At that time the population of Ting Hsien was given as 88,111. This was a little more than one-fifth of the 1929 population figure, but if allowance is made for some under-reporting the total was probably about one quarter of the 1929 figure. The population apparently was doubling about once per century. At that rate the average population increase was 0.75 per cent per year.

Since revision of the number of persons in the family was prohibited by Imperial decree, it was not long before the tax base had but little relation to the actual number of persons in the family. There must have been many complaints over the inequity, for only 11 years later, in the second year of Yung Cheng, the head tax was discontinued and a compensating amount was added to the land tax.

A national labor draft was instituted by the Ming emperors to provide the workers needed to build their new palaces, first in Nanking and later in Peking. Quotas were set for the provinces and passed on to the hsien. Later the labor assessment was converted into a money payment. In 1724 the amount for Ting Hsien was only 33.75 taels. This too was added to the land tax.

The head tax and the labor assessment together totaled 8,097.507 taels, 20.7 per cent of the total basic land tax. The different land tax rates were all increased by that per cent. The resident o nei owners' rate became 15.927 tael cents per tax mu, equivalent to 4.55 tael cents per standard mu of good land, 2.28 cents for the poor land, and 1.14 for the very poor land. The o wei rates varied from 1.207 to 15.932 tael cents per mu with the average 2.282 cents per mu.

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 .AF 12 North China AF 12

PART 3. AGRICULTURE

CHAPTER X

Farm Land: Ownership and Operation

OVER 92 PER CENT of the Ting Hsien families owned some farm land. Over 96 per cent farmed some land. All but 5,484 of the 70,034 families were land owners. All but 2,745 were farm operators. Only 1,361 families, 1.9 per cent, reported no farming connection. The average land holdings were: owners 21.9 mu, operators 21.2 mu, all families 20.4 mu. Just under 6 per cent of the land owning families rented land to others. Thirty per cent of the farming families rented land from others. Twelve per cent of the privately owned crop area was rented. Only 4.8 per cent of the farm operating families were full tenants. Only 1.3 per cent of the renters were share croppers. Only 0.7 per cent of the families were non-farming landlords. Twenty-eight per cent of the land was double cropped. The estimated value of the crops produced totaled some sixteen million dollars, an average of some $11.25 per mu and $40 per capita. These are the outstanding figures of our study, in 1931, of land ownership and farm operation.

Accurate figures on the area of Ting Hsien were not available as it had never been surveyed. The official land records were manifestly incomplete as it was generally recognized that there was a considerable amount of "black land" that was not on the books at the yamen and so escaped taxation. We were told that in not a few villages three sets of land books were kept, one to show the officials, one to show the villagers, one, the complete one, for the village elders. We were not able to verify this report but it is indicative of the difficulty of getting a complete land report.

In making our land study we did not attempt to secure the figures of the hsien land office but went instead to the village elders and got from them a report on the amount of land their village controlled. Any error in their figures undoubtedly would tend to be an under rather than an

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

435 proportion was 25.2 per cent, but it was only 8 per cent in the 4th District.

In 238 villages controlling 839,540 mu of land, of which 55.4 per cent was irrigated, 21.9 per cent of the unirrigated land was worth less than $25 and 66.2 per cent less than $50 per mu. Only 0.6 per cent was worth $100 or more. For the irrigated land the figures were practically reversed. Only 0.2 per cent was reported as worth less than $25 per mu, while 20.9 per cent was worth $100 or more. For the irrigated land the median value was between $75 and $99 per mu. For the unirrigated land it was between $25 and $49 per mu. (See Table 62.)

427 Only 3,826 families, 5.9 per cent of the land owning families, rented land to others. All but 514 of this number were owner-lessors and
423 farmed part of the land they owned. The 514 non-farming landlords, who rented all the land they owned, were only 0.7 per cent of the Ting Hsien families. One-third of the non-farming landlords lived in the city and another one-sixth in the 1st District. Of the families living in the city, 7.8 per cent were listed as landlords. In the 1st District the figure was 1.5 per cent. In the other districts the non-farming landlords were not more than 0.7 per cent of the families. In the 4th District the figure was only 0.1 per cent.

The land rented to others by the owner-lessors and the landlords totaled 173,890 mu, 12.2 per cent of the privately owned crop area. (See Table 63.) Crop area, rather than farm area, figures are used as they do not include waste land, land used for houses, graves, and roads and so give a better basis for farming figures.

There was much more renting in the city and the 1st District around it than in the other districts. In this connection it must be remembered that 28,210 mu of land in the city and the three suburbs were classed as farm land and included in the crop area. In the 1st District and the city together 23.9 per cent of the crop area was rented, in the 2nd District 16.3 per cent, but in the 3rd District only 6.9 per cent. For the other districts the rental figures were all slightly more than 10 per cent.

Full tenants, those who rented all the land they farmed, numbered only 3,253. They were 4.7 per cent of all the families in the hsien and 4.8 per cent of the farm-operating families. The part-owners, who owned part and rented part of the land they farmed, were 24.2 per cent of all the families and 25.2 per cent of the farming families. If the part-owners are included in the tenant group the tenancy figure was 30

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 . AF 12 North China AF 12

per cent of the farm operators, but then more than five out of six of the tenant group owned part of the land they farmed. If, on the other hand, the part-owners are included in the owning group the owner-farmers were 91.4 per cent of all the families and 95.1 per cent of the farming families. Tenancy could hardly be called a serious problem in Ting Hsien.

Renting part of a family's land holding was usually a matter of renting one or more separate fields. In a study of the land holdings of 1,136 families in four villages we found that the number of fields per family varied from one to 29; that 70 per cent of the families owned more than one field; that the total number of fields was 3,798; that the average was 3.3 fields per family. In one village the average was 5.2 fields per family. In another it was 2.9 fields. The highest average was in the smallest village of 103 families. The lowest average was in the largest village with 586 families. Just over two-thirds of the families, 67.4 per cent, had from one to three fields. Only 3.0 per cent had more than 10 fields.

In size the individual fields ranged from less than one mu to 78 mu. Twenty-five per cent were less than two mu, 70 per cent were under five mu, and 78.5 per cent were less than six mu, one acre. Only 8.8 per cent of the fields contained 10 or more mu while only 14 fields, 0.4 per cent, were as large as 30 mu, five acres. The average was just under five mu.

In the four villages 40 per cent of the fields were less than one li, one-third of a mile, from the owner's home in the village, while 87 per cent were within three li, one mile. In one village, however, almost one-quarter of the fields were reported to be more than one mile from the village. In two villages families reported that they had fields as much as two miles from their house. (See Table 64.)

The average family holding in the four villages was some 16 mu or six mu less than the hsien average. If allowance is made for this difference the average number of plots per land owning family in the hsien was probably at least four and possibly even slightly more.

The government's estimate of the average number of fields per family is shown by the minimum number of deeds the villages were required to submit in connection with the deed inspection program announced in August, 1927. At least 500 deeds were to be presented by villages with from 50 to 200 families, 1,500 by the 200 to 500 family villages, and 3,000 by those with from 500 to 1,000 families. With the minimum re-

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF12

quirement three deeds per family and the maximum 10, the normal expectation evidently was between four and five deeds per family.

The division of the family land holdings, the relatively small size of the plots, the distances from the village, all would make for difficult farming, consume extra time in going to and from the fields, and require extra transportation of tools. At harvest time it would greatly complicate the supervision and protection of the crops and may very well have been one of the reasons for the Green Crop Society or the Agricultural Association taking over the general watching of the crops.

Only 271 families, 1.3 per cent of the 20,185 families who rented farm land, paid their rent by giving the landlord a share of the crop produced on the land. It had been our expectation that this would be a much higher figure. For over half the renters, 54.0 per cent, the rent was fixed in dollars. For 40.4 per cent it was stated in quantities of millet, cotton, wheat, or kaoliang per mu but usually it was paid in money, the amount being determined by the market value of the crop-rent at the time of payment. (See Table 65.) Millet was the most generally used unit for the cash-crop rent. It was reported by 7,947 families. Cotton was the unit for only 212 families. Wheat and kaoliang were used by only a few families.

Sample rent studies showed amounts ranging from 50 cents to $7.50 per mu and returns to the landlord of from 3.0 to 8.9 per cent of the value of the land. The average return apparently was not more than 6.0 per cent. There was considerable variation in the return on land of different value in a given area and on land of the same value in different parts of the hsien. Generally the middle value land appeared to be in greater demand than either the cheaper or the more expensive land and therefore to command a somewhat higher return.

Estimated rents in the 1st District were generally between 3.0 and 3.5 per cent of the value of the unirrigated land and from 4.0 to 4.6 per cent of the value of the irrigated land.

The rates were higher in two sample villages, one in the north part of the hsien, the other in the south. For the north village the average return was 5.9 per cent. For the south village it was 20 per cent higher, 7.1 per cent. (See Table 66.)

In six villages in the Experimental District the cash rent averaged 5.9, 6.3, and 5.2 per cent for the first, second, and third grades of land.

In our study of 400 farm families the average rent figure was $1.69 per mu for land worth less than $40 per mu, $3.63 for the middle grade of

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 North China AF12

land worth from $40 to $79 per mu, and $4.20 for the land worth $80 or more per mu. The amounts were 6.2, 6.0, and 4.8 per cent of the average values of the three grades of land. For all the families the average was 5.25 per cent. (See Chapter III.)

Considering the high interest rates paid on loans we have been interested to find these relatively low returns on land values. Evidently the fact that land was the chief medium for investment in the rural areas had so increased the price that the rent produced only a relatively small yield on the land value.

The cash-crop rent paid in cotton was 35, 20, and 8 catties per mu for the first, second, and third grade land in one village of our six village group. In another village the rates were 40, 24.5, and 10 catties per mu. The millet rates were the same in both villages, 7.0 and 1.5 tou for first and third grade land. In two sample villages one tou of wheat was accepted as the equivalent of two tou of millet although at 1928 prices one tou of wheat was equal to 1.8 tou of millet and at 1931 prices to 1.6 tou.

In some villages, where the land was double cropped, from one-half to two-thirds of the rent was paid after the spring harvest.

In the six villages the cash rent, in 1928, was regularly higher than the cash-crop rent for the first and second grades of land, with values from $40 to $120 per mu, but it was lower for the third class land worth from $10 to $40 per mu. The more than 30 per cent drop in grain prices from 1928 to 1931 would greatly augment the difference for the higher priced lands and about equalize the rents for the third class land, if there was no change in the cash rents. However, it seems probable that the cash rents also went down unless the land was rented for more than one year.

Cotton rents were higher than grain rents in 1928 and the difference apparently was even larger in 1931 as the price of cotton went down some 11 per cent in three years while grain prices dropped more than 30 per cent.

The figures of our sample rent studies indicate that the cash and the cash-crop rent charge averaged between 35 and 40 per cent of the average gross income from the land. Share rent was regularly 50 per cent of the crop.

In one village the majority of the renters had their land on a year by year basis. In another village the landlords required a written rental

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

423 contract, usually for a three year term. They also required an advance rent of $1.00 per mu. This was refunded at the end of the term, but was 427 kept by the landlord in case the tenant gave up the land before the end of the rental contract. Another report said that the share rent contracts were generally on a one year basis, the cash-crop more often on a three year basis, while the cash contracts were often for five years.

One village rented its school land for a term of five years. The rent was paid in money, the amount being fixed by bidding at a town meeting when the previous renting contract expired. The successful bidder was required to have his contract guaranteed by one of his friends. Another village reported that the rent on its school land was set at $3.00 per mu per year.

There were 2,739 more farm-operating families than there were farm-owning families. The addition of 3,253 full tenant families and the subtraction of the 514 non-farming landlord families accounted for the difference. The crop area farmed by the operating families, 1,424,930 mu, was larger by some 8,070 mu than that held by the farm-owning families. The difference was the result of renting, to private operators, the lands owned by schools, temples, villages, or other public organizations. The average farm, per operating family, was 21.2 mu, only slightly less than the 21.9 mu average of the land-owning families. For an average family of 5.8 persons the average amount of land per person was 3.7 mu, about 0.6 of an acre.

The proportions of the operating families farming 50 or more mu and less than 25 mu were both less than the figures for the land owning families holding those amounts. The large land owners and the landlords reduced their holdings by renting, the tenants and the small land owners increased theirs. One hundred and thirty-two families owned 300 or more mu but only 15 families were farming that much land. The 840 families farming from 100 to 299 mu were almost one-third less than the families owning that much land. At least 141 and possibly considerably more of the 4,460 families owning from 50 to 99 mu rented out some of their land. After the land holding went above 60 mu, 10 acres, it apparently became more and more advantageous to rent part of the land rather than farm it with family or hired labor. The tenant shared the risk of the farm operation.

241 Detailed reports were secured on the area devoted to some 37 different crops. The list included nine grains, four legumes, six vegetables, three

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 , AF 12 North China AF 12

daily rates are those paid under normal conditions rather than the harvest peak.

The holidays and festivals usually observed in the Experimental District were:

First Days of the First Month: New Year Festival
15th of the First Month: Feast of Lanterns
2nd of the Second Month: The Dragon Raises His Head
21st of the Third Month: Pei Ch'i Temple Fair
5th of the Fifth Month: Spring Festival
13th of the Sixth Month: Kuan Kung Festival
15th of the Eighth Month: Fall Festival
9th of the Ninth Month: End of Work in the Fields
Tung Chih: Beginning of Winter
8th of the Twelfth Month: La Pa

TABLE 58. CROP AREA PER FAMILY, VILLAGE AVERAGES

Mu	*1st District*		*Experimental District*		*Hsien*	
	Villages	*Per Cent*	*Villages*	*Per Cent*	*Villages*	*Per Cent*
Under 10	–	–	–	–	11	2.4
10–14	2	2.8	1	1.6	64	14.1
15–19	13	18.3	15	24.3	142	31.4
20–24	31	43.7	23	37.1	108	23.8
25–29	21	29.6	12	19.3	67	14.8
30–34	3	4.2	6	9.6	33	7.3
35–39	1	1.4	4	6.5	13	2.9
40–44	–	–	–	–	8	1.8
45–49	–	–	–	–	2	0.4
50 and over	–	–	1	1.6	5	1.1
	71	100.0	62	100.0	453	100.0

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

423 ●
427

TABLE 59. LARGEST FARM HOLDING, 453 VILLAGES[1]

Mu	*Villages*	*Per Cent*	*Mu*	*Villages*	*Per Cent*
Under 50	7	1.6	300–349	31	6.8
50–99	81	17.9	350–399	22	4.9
100–149	126	27.8	400–499	16	3.5
150–199	83	18.3	500–999	14	3.1
200–249	42	9.3	1,000–1,499	1[2]	0.2
250–299	29	6.4	1,500 and over	1[3]	0.2
				453	100.0

[1] Largest holding in city, 3,950 mu. [2] 1,150. [3] 1,800.

TABLE 60. SIZE OF FARMS PRIVATELY OWNED

Area	*Number*	*Per Cent*	*Mu*	*Per Cent*	*Average*
Under 25 mu	46,447	72.0	468,940	33.1	10.1
25–49	12,288	19.0	401,230	28.3	32.7
50–99	4,460	6.9	304,830	21.5	68.1
100–299	1,223	1.9	180,280	12.7	147.0
300 and over	132	0.2	61,580	4.4	466.0
Total or average	64,550	100.0	1,416,860	100.0	22.0

TABLE 61. VALUE OF FARM LAND

471
423

Value per Mu	*Total Mu*	*Per Cent*
Under $25	149,160	10.5
25–49	344,320	24.3
50–74	399,340	28.2
75–99	307,190	21.7
100–124	169,010	11.9
125–149	39,580	2.8
150 and over	8,260	0.6
	1,416,860[1]	100.0

[1] Publicly owned land omitted.

2:Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF12 North China AF12

361 369 Each of the villages and towns included a residence area, in which all the families lived and which was regularly surrounded by some sort of protective wall, and the fields adjacent to and surrounding the residence area. Definite boundaries were fixed between the fields of the different villages. The provincial regulations of 1928 required that they be marked by boundary stones. Boundary lines were drawn because each village assessed the land it controlled to provide funds, when needed, for village expenses for schools, home guard, and crop watching.

134 361 423 The amount of arable land controlled by the villages varied from 245 to 32,500 mu. Nineteen per cent had less than 1,000 mu. Some 73 per cent had less than one square mile of farm land. Only 10 per cent had as much as 6,000 mu, 1,000 acres. The average was 3,065 mu. The total farm area of the villages and the city was 1,424,931 mu, approximately 371 square miles. This was 76 per cent of the total area of the hsien.

Although the village boundaries were set and regularly maintained, it apparently was possible for land on the periphery to be transferred to an adjoining village if it was sold to a resident of that village. It was also evident that new villages could be formed and secure control of the surrounding land. The number of villages had been growing during the previous eighty years, for the hsien history of 1849 gave the number as 423 or 30 less than at the time of our study.

We also found 19 residence areas that were not recognized as separate villages but might well be later on. They evidently had been set up because of crowding in the original residence areas, but did not control the surrounding farm lands and did not have separate governments so were still satellite villages.

103 Seventy-one, 58 per cent, of the 123 villages in the 1st and Experimental Districts (10 villages were in both districts) were given a family surname. Six were named for the Wang family. Some nine different terms were used for village, walled village, castle, residence, camp, hamlet. The most usual one, used 26 times, was ——— chia chuang, village of the house of ———. There were 13 pairs of villages, north-south, east-west, big-little. Fifteen villages were named for physical features, a neighboring river, a bridge, a dyke, a gate, low ground, specially good soil, or white earth. One group of five villages were different goat yards. There was the village of the eight brothers, four families, ten families, eight cornered man, horse's head, old crow, head light, cow village, and

6:Young et. al. E-5 (1928-1929) 1930 AF12 North China AF12

CHAXTER VI.

ECONOMY.

1. Wealth or Property.

An enquiry into the economic phases of social life 423 is usually the most difficult part of a survey because people are immediately on their guard when any question is raised in regard to wealth or property, and enquiries concerning such matters will usually encounter suspicion and arouse bad feeling. The field workers found Ching Ho no exception and had a very difficult time collecting data on this particular phase, and we know that what we are now presenting has not the same accuracy as other acpects of the survey. In order to get as near as possible to a correct figure indirect measures have had to be used, and inferences drawn from other sources.

The first question that has to be answered is whe ther the people hold property or not. Of course, every store must have some kind of property or capital, so that we will deal with the families first.

In the 371 families investigated we found that there were 139 families who did not possess any property at all, beyond their own personal belongings and a few pieces of furniture. (The term property here means those effects which cen be turned, into money such as land, houses or business investment.) Of the 229 families which have some kind of private

423

property or wealth, ninety have houses only, seventy have both house and land, twenty three have business investments only, while eighteen have all three kinds of property. From this it will be seen that there are only fourteen families owning land as against ninety owning a house only, which seems to point to the fact that people prefer to have their house first before they invest in land.

TABLE XXIX. DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY PROPERTY

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP	NO. OF FAMILIES	PERCENTAGE
No property	139	37.5
House	92	25.1
House and land	70	18.9
Business investment	23	6.2
House, land, businese.	18	4.9
Land	14	3.8
House and business	9	2.4
Land and business	4	1.1
Donkey only	1	0.3
Total	371	100.0

423 565 If we turn our attention to the value of the property of the 229 families, we find that the distribution is fairly equal and that there are no extremely rich people in the town. The average value of property for the 225 families where the value has been known to the field workers is $654.

6:Young et. al. E-5 (1928-1929) 1930 AF12 North China AF12

TABLE XXX DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY VALUE

423

VALUE (IN MEX. DOLLARS)	NO. OF FAMILIES
0 - 49	25
50 - 99	28
100 - 199	33
200 - 299	19
300 - 399	19
400 - 499	18
500 - 749	32
750 - 999	13
1,000 - 1,499	12
1,000 - 1,999	9
2,000 - 2,999	11
3,000 - 4,999	3
5,000 -	3
Total	225
Value unknown	4

2. Housing

The first question that arises in regard to housing is that of ownership. In Ching-ho there are 183 fam-

6:Young et. al. E-5 (1928-1929) 1930 AF12 North China AF12

423 ilies or 50.3% who own their own houses, which even when combined with the few cases of pawned houses, is not a very high percentage.

TABLE XXXI. OWNERSHIP OF HOUSES

OWNERSHIP	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Owned	183	50.3
Rented	174	47.8
Pawned	7	1.9
Total	364	100.0
Unknown	7	

In tabulating the value of the houses, only those owned by the dweller are considered here, because it is impossible for the renters to give even the approximate value of the house. Most of the houses are valued at $100 to $200 dollars. The average value for the 170 houses where the value is known is $384.

TABLE XXXII. DISTRIBUTION OF VALUE OF HOUSES

VALUE ($)	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Under 50	16	9.4
50 - 99	35	20.6
100 - 199	32	18.9
200 - 299	27	15.9
300 - 499	23	13.5
500 - 999	24	14.1
1,000 - 1,999	9	5.3
2.000 -	4	2.4
Total	170	100.0
Unknown	13	

ECONOMY

3. Agricultural Land

As previously mentioned there are 103 families 423 owning some amount of land, but most of these land owners have only about a dozen mow of land, and only four families have more than one hundred mow. The average amount owned by each family is 29 mow, too small an amount to maintain a family of five on a decent scale. The distribution is as follows:

TABLE XXXV. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND AREA

NO. OF MOW	NO. OF FAMILIES	PERCENTAGE
Under 5	13	13.3
5 - 9	18	18.4
10 - 14	15	15.3
15 - 19	13	13.3
20 - 29	9	9.2
30 - 49	15	15.3
50 - 99	11	11.2
100 - 199	4	4.2
Total	91	100.0
Unknown	1	

The average value of the land owned by the various families is $695, idistributed as follows:

6:Young et. al. E-5 (1928-1929) 1930 AF12 North China AF12

TABLE XXXVI. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND VALUE

423

VALUE (DOLLBRS)	NO. OF CASES	NO. OF CASES
Under 100	7	7.1
100 - 199	16	16.3
200 - 299	8	8.2
300 - 339	13	13.3
400 - 499	15	15.3
500 - 479	10	10.2
750 - 999	9	9.2
1,000 - 1,999	15	15.3
2,000 - 2,999	2	2.0
3,000 -	3	3.1
Total	98	100.0
Unknown	8	

423
427 Only 24 families rent land from others snd six families both own their own land and at the same time rent land from others. This percentage is relatively low in comparison with other distribts of China and in comparison with the housing situation.

TABLE XXXVII. OWNERSHIP OF LAND

OWNERSHIP	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Owned	116	79.5
Rented	24	16.4
Half owned	6	4.1
Total	146	100.0

ECONOMY

The acreage of the rented land is much smaller than the acreage of owned land, the average size of land rented by the 24 families being only 9.6 mow as compared with 29 mow of owned land. Most of the families rented only a few mow of land. 427

TABLE XXXVIII. ACREAGE OF RENTED LAND.

AREA-MOW	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Under 5	6	25.0
5 - 9	13	54.2
10 - 19	2	8.3
20 - 29	2	8.3
30 - 49	1	4.2
Total	24	100.0

If we combine together the land held under these there types of ownership we shall get the land area of each farmstead or holding. The average size of farmstead or holding is 26 mow with most of the distribution in the first four classes. 423

TABLE XXXIX. SIZE OF HOLDINGS

SIZE (MOWS)	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Under 5	19	15.6
5 - 9	30	24.6
10 - 14	15	12.3
15 - 19	15	12.3
20 - 29	10	8.2
30 - 49	16	13.1
50 - 99	13	10.7
100 - 199	4	3.3
Total	122	100.0
Unknown	8	

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

family was given the use of a ten-room foreign-style house, and another family owned a 21-room house. Then too, adding the rent value to the income often has put a family in a higher income group than would otherwise be the case. In spite of these complications, however, it has seemed the best way of adjusting the family accounts so that they all included expenditure for rent; and the best method of giving an accurate picture of the housing situation of all the families.

Fifty-one families owned the houses in which they were living at the beginning of the budget year. Nine more owned property they might have occupied but, when the study began, were living in rented houses, or in quarters given them by their employers. Three of the nine moved into their own houses during the year. The 60 house owners are 21.2 per cent of the families studied. How this compares with all of Peiping it is impossible to say, as there are no available figures on home-owning for the entire city. In some of the larger American cities from 23.4 to 38.9 per cent of the families own their own homes.[1]

It was surprising to find that nine families with incomes of less than $25 a month were property owners. This was 8 per cent of the families in that income group. As the family income increased, the proportion owning property naturally increased and increased rapidly. It was 18 per cent for the families with incomes between $25 and $50 a month; 34 per cent for those whose incomes were between $50 and $100 a month; 47 per cent for those receiving more than $100 a month; and 64 per cent for those whose income was more than $200 a month.

[1] U. S. Census, 1920, for Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and St. Louis.

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

There were 19 families who paid no rent during the entire year, but did not own the houses in which they lived. Two lived in houses given them free by their relatives. Seventeen were given their houses by their employers as part of their salaries or wages. They were watchmen, gate-keepers, workers in stores or factories, school-teachers, preachers and others engaged in religious work.

Twenty families paid no rent during part of the year; to seven of these, houses were given for part of the time by their employers; to seven others, houses were loaned by relatives or friends, for one or more months; six families lived part of the year in houses that they owned, and part of the year in rented property.

Fourteen families reported that they rented larger houses than they needed for their own use, and then endeavored to sublet the extra rooms. If all the extra rooms could be rented, there was apparently a profit of 75 cents to $1 per room per month. Three families made enough in this way to give them their own rooms rent-free; three others, enough to pay part of the rent for the rooms they used. The other eight families were unable to get enough to pay the rent of the extra rooms. One family, who had been using three rooms and paying $5.50 a month rent, in May took over the other five rooms in the house and paid a total rent of $17 a month. Their venture was a complete loss, as they were unable to sublet any of the rooms. Finally in October they moved to a six-room house, for which they paid $12 a month. Another family paid $30 a month for a twelve-room house. They planned to use eight rooms and sublet four. The four rooms were rented for three months, but from April

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

to September the family was unable to find any tenants. Beginning in September, three rooms were rented for $7 a month. The total receipts for the year were only $43, or less than the cost of two rooms.

One hundred and ninety-three families—68 per cent of the group—paid rent for their houses during the entire year.

Fifty-five families moved from one house to another during the year. Seven families moved more than once, and one family moved four times in twelve months. The latter was a family of four, a couple, the husband's sixty-seven-year-old mother, and a fourteen-year-old son. From December to April, they lived in a two-room rented house, for which they paid $2 a month. In April, they moved to a two-room house owned by a relative. For this they paid no rent. In May, they moved to another relative's house; and, in June, to still another. In September, they moved once more, this time to a two-room house for which they paid $1.57 a month. The family was helped by relatives, as the man had lost his position with the *Kuo Min Chün,* the People's Army, and was able to get work for only three months. His income for the year was $49.30; his expenditure $354.70. Fortunately the family had some savings from which they could meet most of their budget.

If these figures are typical, Peiping families do an unusual amount of moving from one house to another. Almost one out of every five families, 19.5 per cent, a large proportion, moved during the year. Americans are noted for being a restless people, but they apparently move less often than this group of Peiping families. According to the records of the American Telephone and Telegraph

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

000 because of unpleasant family relations. The occupations of the families of these resident workers[1] may be roughly grouped as 463 farming 60, labouring 21, and commercial 5. It is interesting 423 to note that of the families in the three classes, 81 possessed some sort of farm or house property in the country. Table 17 shows the value of property including the farm and house in the possession of the families of the resident workers. Their valuation was all offered by the workers under investigation. Although they could not be verified from independent sources, yet it may be presumed that they could not be too far from the truth.

Table 17.—Value of Property of the Families of the 86 Resident Workers

Value of property	Number of workers' families
Under $1.000	40
$1.000 and under $2.000	24
$2.000 and under $3.000	8
$3.000 and under $4.000	5
$4.000 and under $5.000	2
$5.000 and above $5.000	2
Families owning properties	81
Families owning no property	5
Total	86

It is to be noted that five families had no property whatsoever. 64 families had property at less than $2,000; 17 families possessed more than $2,000 and only two families had property worth more than $5,000. Under the present disturbed conditions in the country, the value of property has already depreciated a great deal. It should be remembered that the properties of these workmen are without exception inherited from their ancesters and not acquired by themselves. Moreover, the property of each family will have to be divided among brothers, sisters and other immediate relatives. After such

[1] [A SAMPLE OF THE WORKERS IN THE CHINA TA SALT REFINERY IN TANGKU — ANALYST]

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

division, how pitiably small each portion will be, it can be imagined.

The size and composition of the so-called "greater family" of the workers at their native places are shown in Table 18.

Table 18.—Size and Member Relationship of 86 Families

Number of persons in family	Number of families	Per cent
1	1	1.2
2	3	3.5
3	9	10.5
4	14	16.3
5	17	19.8
6	12	14.0
7	12	14.0
8	3	3.5
9	6	7.0
10	4	4.7
12	2	2.3
14	2	2.3
Total	86	100.0
Average number of persons per family	5.96	

Member relationship	Number of persons	Per cent
Heads of family (i. e. workers)	86	22.6
Wives	41	8.0
Sons	21	4.1
Daughters	8	1.6
Fathers	48	9.3
Mothers	64	12.5
Brothers	116	22.6
Sisters	24	4.7
Sisters-in-law	38	7.4
Nephews	28	5.4
Nieces	18	3.5
Uncles	7	1.4
Aunts	7	1.4
Grand fathers	3	.6
Grand mothers	3	.6
Stepmother	1	.2
Grand son	1	.2
Total	514	100.0

The family of from four to seven members seems to be the predominating type. The miximum size of the worker's family had 14 members, while the average size of each family is about six.

From the composition of these families in Table 18, it will also be noted that from the grandfather, the grandmother and the uncle down to the grandson, all immediate relatives usually live in one household. It has been the custom in China for sons to live with their parents after marriage, and the size of a family

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

youth or in vigorous and strong manhood. There were among the male members 67 gainfully employed versus 45 unemployed. If we exclude the boys under 15 who were not yet fit to work, the unemployed would be approximately 10 per cent. Among the female members, there were only 41 employed versus 74 unemployed; in fact, if the girls under 15 were not considered, the number of females employed and that of females unemployed was about equal.

It will have been noted that 65 of the employed males in the 61 families were all working at the Chiu Ta Works. Of this number, 61 may be considered as principal wage earners of the respective families, while four others were only earning wages to supplement the family income. The earnings of the female members were generally insignificant. They were mainly engaged in sewing salt bags or making garments which were used as gifts to the workers, but it seems that the work had been very much reduced during the last year, since the curtailment of the production of salt and also the commutation of the gifts of clothing.

Table 31.—Value of Property of 61 Families

Value of property	Number of families
Under $1,000	27
$1,000 and under $2,000	14
$2,000 and under $3,000	2
$3,000 and under $4,000	1
$4,000 and under $5,000	2
$5,000 and above	1
Families owning properties	47
Families owning no property	14
Total	61

According to the reports of the workers, 47 of the 61 working families possessed property of some kind, but only two of

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

423 them had their own houses in Tangku. The property of others was owned jointly by the workers and their family members in their native places.

212 Table 32 shows the distribution of literates and illiterates among the members of the 61 families. Excluding children under seven, over two-thirds were illiterates, but even among the literates only 27 could manage to read daily newspapers. It was found that the latter had all received some formal education. The low educational standard of the workers having families may be attributed to two causes: first, they were older and have less aptitude for learning, and secondly, they had family affairs to take care of and less time for study. It was further found that of the 18 young girls of schooling age, only two were in the primary school. Those who did not attend any school were kept at home to help in domestic work.

Table 32.—Literacy and Illiteracy of the Members of 61 Families

Member relationship	Total number of persons	Number of illiterates	Number of Literates	
			Not being able to read newspaper	Being able to read newspaper
Workmen	61	27	13	21
Wives	58	58	—	—
Sons	38	28	7	3
Daughters	41	39	2	—
Fathers	2	1	—	1
Mothers	9	9	—	—
Brothers	8	5	2	1
Sisters	3	3	—	—
Daughters-in-law	2	2	—	—
Sister-in-law	1	1	—	—
Grandson	1	1	—	—
Nephews	2	1	—	1
Niece	1	1	—	—
Total	227	176[1]	24	27

[1] Including 54 children under 7

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

those who had experience in other places. As the assistants are required to know some elementary English and arithmetic, most of them were students of primary schools. The majority of the common workers, however, come from the farmer class.

As shown in Table 48, the size of the family of these 50 workers varied from 2 to 16 members, with an average of 6.4 persons to a family. About 56 per cent of the families had from 3 to 6 members to a family. It appears that the constitution of these families is by no means homogeneous. Such members of the family as parents, brothers, sisters, sister-in-law, nephews, nieces etc. constituted as much as 68 per cent of the total.

Table 48.—Size and Member Relationship of 50 Families

Number of Persons in Family	Number of Families	Per cent
2	3	6
3	5	10
4	6	12
5	8	16
6	9	18
7	4	8
8	3	6
9	3	6
10	4	3
11	2	4
12	2	4
16	1	2
Total	50	100
Average number of persons per family	6.4	

Number Relationship	Number	Per cent
Head of families (i. e. workers)	50	15.6
Wives	20	6.3
Sons	17	5.3
Daughters	15	4.7
Fathers	29	9.1
Mothers	40	12.5
Brothers	67	20.9
Sisters	13	4.1
Sisters-in-law	23	7.2
Nephews	22	6.9
Nieces	12	3.8
Uncles	5	1.5
Aunts	4	1.2
Grandfathers	1	0.3
Grandmothers	2	0.6
Total	320	100.0

The economic condition of the 50 families varies. Generally speaking, firemen and common workers came from country districts of Chihli and Shantung and they had small lots of land to maintain the livelihood of their families. The families of mechanics lived mostly near Tientsin and they depended primari-

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

423 ly on their skill to make a living. Whatever little property they might have was not sufficient for the subsistence of their families, and they must have depended upon their earnings to support them.

Table 49.—Value of Property of the Families of 50 Resident Workers

Value of property	Number of worker's families
Under $1.000	23
$1.000 and under $2.000	14
$2.000 and under $3.000	7
$3.000 and under $4.000	1
$4.000 and under $5.000	1
Families owning properties	46
Families owning on property	4
Total	50

The assistants, as a rule, were young and capable of self-support, as the family burden was usually borne by their fathers or brothers. Their economic conditions were, therefore, comparatively better.

It was found that 46 of the workers had some property. The estimated value of the properties is distributed as in Table 49.

162 Of the 50 workers, 22 were married, but two of them later became widowers. The ages of marriage of the 22 couples are

Table 50.—Age of Marriage of 22 Couples

Age of marriage	Husbands	Wives
11-15	2	4[1]
16-20	12	16
21-25	7	2
26-30	1	—
Total	22	22
Average age of marriage	19.4	17.9[2]

[1] Two of this group were daughters-in-law-to-be who began to live with her furture husband's family at this early age.
[2] Excluding two daughters-in-law-to-be.